UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

		2008 MAY -6 PM 2: 51
TO: Majornipher US DISTRICT HIDGE / MILE MAGISTRATE HIDGE Majornipher DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
C. S. DISTRICT JUDGE/ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
DEPUTY DEPUTY		
CASE TITLE: Daughtery v. Wilson, et al		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion to Amend Pleading and File Additional Pleadings		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy
X	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
X	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
	.7.1	Missing table of contents
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
		Supplemental documents require court order
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X		OTHER: No proof of service.
		Date forwarded: <u>5/1/2008</u>
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
	The docume	ent is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
		ent is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a order on all parties.
	Rejected do	cument to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursu to Local Rule 83.1	
	. Docar IXu.	CHAMBERS OF: Mayo1
	Dated: 5/	16/08 CHAMBERS OF: Mayor By: law Clerk
	cc: All Parti	es — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —